

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Interview Summary

A telephonic conversation was conducted with the Examiner, Jonathan Harper, by the Applicants' representative, Rabindranath Dutta. Reg. No. 51,010 on December 23, 2008 based on communications initiated by the Applicants.

If the Examiner believes that further information needs to be made of record to comply with the requirements of 37 CFR 1.133, Applicants request the Examiner to identify such further information.

Request for Additional interviews if needed

The Examiner assured the Applicants representative on December 23, 2008 that he would call the Applicants' representative to discuss the case on reviewing the amendment in order to expedite prosecution. In an abundance of caution, Applicants are submitting an Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form with the amendment. Applicants request the Examiner to call the Applicants' representative, Rabindranath Dutta, Reg. No., 51,010 at telephone number 310-557-2292, should any further issues arise that may be resolved expeditiously via a telephone call through an Examiner's amendment or via a supplemental amendment.

Claims are amended for expeditious prosecution

This amendment is being filed in response to the non-final office action dated 9/23/2008. In the current amendment, Applicants have added system and computer readable storage medium claims corresponding to the method claims. Applicants had earlier canceled all non-method claims in the Application.

Applicants are not conceding in this Application that the amendments imply that the claims presented earlier are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, as the present claim amendments are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of the application. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue these and other claims, including the original claims, in one or more continuations and/or divisional patent application

Claim Rejections

In the office action dated 9/23/2008 all claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C.

103(a) as being unpatentable over:

- (a) Delphi 4 Unleashed Chapter 3 (referred to as “Polymorphism” by the Examiner),
in view of
(b) US 7,165,104 (referred to as “Wang” by the Examiner). [New art cited in rejections for the
by the Examiner in the Office Action dated 9/23/2008]

Applicants traverse the rejection of the pending claims.

Independent claims 11, 36, 47

Independent claims 11, 26, 47 require:

receiving a request implemented via at least one device independent class;
traversing a class hierarchy database to determine at least one device specific class that
corresponds to the at least one device independent class, wherein the class hierarchy database
stores a class hierarchy and associations between classes;
modifying the received request, wherein in the modified request the least one device
independent class has been translated to the at least one device specific class;
generating a device specific request in a device specific language; and
sending the device specific request in the device specific language to a managed device,
wherein

(i) in the class hierarchy database, a first base class at a higher level in the class hierarchy
is connected to a second base class and a third base class that are at a lower level in the class
hierarchy, wherein the second and third base classes are connected via a base association;

(ii) in the class hierarchy database, the second base class is connected to a first specific
class that corresponds to the first base class, the third base class is connected to a second specific
class that corresponds to the second base class, wherein the first specific class and the second
specific class are connected by a specific association;

(iii) in response to a request for specific association instances based on providing a source
class corresponding to the second base class and a requested class corresponding to the third base
class, deriving one class supported by the managed device via the specific association.

The new claims 36 and 47 are system and article of manufacture claims corresponding to method claim 11.

Applicants respectfully submit the cited Wang in col. 7 lines 1-15 and lines 61-67 does not teach or suggest the following claim requirements that have been rejected by the Examiner by citing col. 7, lines 1-15 and lines 61-67 (in page 5 of the Office Action) of the cited Wang:

“(ii) in the class hierarchy database, the second base class is connected to a first specific class that corresponds to the first base class, the third base class is connected to a second specific class that corresponds to the second base class, wherein the first specific class and the second specific class are connected by a specific association;

(iii) in response to a request for specific association instances based on providing a source class corresponding to the second base class and a requested class corresponding to the third base class, deriving one class supported by the managed device via the specific association”

Applicants submit that the following explanation of the support provided by FIG. 6 of the Application for certain claim requirements is relevant to the discussion below and is provided for illustrative purposes only and should not be construed as limiting claims 11, 36, 47 in any way:

- (i) “the first base class” of the claim requirements is supported by the Base Class A of FIG. 6;
- (ii) “the second base class” of the claim requirements is supported by Base Class B 608 of FIG. 6;
- (iii) “the third base class” of the claim requirements is supported by Base Class C 610 of FIG. 6;
- (iv) “the first specific class” of the claim requirements is supported by Specific Class A 616 of FIG. 6; and
- (v) “the second specific class” of the claim requirements is supported by Specific Class B 618 of FIG. 6.

Col. 7, lines 1-15 of the cited Wang is as follows:

“Receipt of an onclick event causes the server appliance 14 to gather data and present that data to the aggregator 224 of the management server 12. When an onclick event occurs, the aggregator looks through the schema's onclick association instance to find a resulting object, initially an

instance of a server appliance 14. The aggregator then gathers data concerning this object. A display format property of the web element is used to determine how the data should be presented to a client on the user interface. Display formats can be defined to be lists, tables, collections, etc.

Listing 1 is a managed object format (MOF) language description of higher level classes that make up the schema 212. This listing is written to be both machine and human readable.”

Col. 7, lines 61-67 of the cited Wang is as follows:

“Aggregator 224

The aggregator performs two main functions. It first acts as a schema interpreter. The schema design described in FIG. 5 is fully implemented in the aggregator. It knows how to interpret a given schema component. For instance if the WebElement class Data Type property is an SQL type query, the aggregator will get the SQL string from the data property and run it.”

Col. 7, lines 1-15 of the cited Wang discusses that an aggregator looks through a schema’s onclick association instance to find a resulting object and then gathers data concerning this object. Listing 1 referenced in col. 7, lines 1-15 of the cited Wang discusses a management object format language description of higher level classes that make up a schema. Col. 7, lines 60-65 of the cited Wang discusses that the aggregator performs as a schema interpreter and references FIG. 5 that shows a schema model. Applicants respectfully submit that col. 7, lines 1-15 of the cited Wang and col. 7, lines 60-65 in association with Listing 1 and FIG. 5 of the cited Wang does not teach or suggest the claim requirements of:

“(ii) in the class hierarchy database, the second base class is connected to a first specific class that corresponds to the first base class, the third base class is connected to a second specific class that corresponds to the second base class, wherein the first specific class and the second specific class are connected by a specific association;

(iii) in response to a request for specific association instances based on providing a source class corresponding to the second base class and a requested class corresponding to the third base class, deriving one class supported by the managed device via the specific association”

Applicants respectfully submit, that neither the cited Wang nor the cited Polymorphism either alone or in combination, teach, disclose, or suggest the new claim limitations of

“(ii) in the class hierarchy database, the second base class is connected to a first specific class that corresponds to the first base class, the third base class is connected to a second specific class that corresponds to the second base class, wherein the first specific class and the second specific class are connected by a specific association;

(iii) in response to a request for specific association instances based on providing a source class corresponding to the second base class and a requested class corresponding to the third base class, deriving one class supported by the managed device via the specific association”

in combination with the other claim requirements that are present in claims 11, 36, or 47.

For the above reasons, claims 11, 36, 47 are patentable over the cited art.

Dependent claims 12-16, 18-20, 34-35, 37-46, 48-57

Additionally, claims 12-16, 18-20, 34-35, 37-46, 48-57 depend directly or indirectly on the pending independent claims 11, 36, 57. Applicants submit that these claims are patentable over the cited art because they depend from independent claims 11, 36, 47 which are patentable over the cited art for the reason discussed above, and because the combination of the limitations in the dependent claims and the base and intervening claims from which claims 12-16, 18-20, 34-35, 37-46, 48-57 depend provide further grounds of distinction over the cited art.

New dependent claims 35, 46, 57

New claims 35, 46, 57 depend on claims 34, 45, 56 respectively, wherein claims 34, 45, 56 depend on the independent claims 11, 36, 47 respectively. Support for the requirements of new claim 34, 46, 57 may be found in at least in FIG. 3 of the Application in blocks referenced by reference numerals 300 and 302. No new matter has been added in new dependent claims 35, 46, and 57 and applicants respectfully submit that neither the cited Polymorphism nor the cited Wang teach or suggest either alone or in combination the claim requirements of:

“wherein the request is received at the proxy from a Common Information Model (CIM) application, and wherein the request is implemented via CIM classes; and

wherein the traversing of the class hierarchy database is performed by a traversal application in a CIM Object Manager (CIMOM) of the proxy to determine all specific subclasses of a CIM superclass that has a specific class corresponding to the managed device.”

For the above reasons, dependent claims 35, 46, 57 are patentable over the cited art.

Dependent claims 34, 45, and 56

Dependent claims 34, 45, 56 depend of independent claims 11, 36, 47 respectively and further require:

“wherein the managed device is coupled to a proxy, wherein the proxy is a computational device, and wherein the receiving, the traversing, the modifying and the generating are performed by the proxy.”

In page 8 of the Office Action, the Examiner has indicated that col. 5, lines 50-60 of the cited Wang discloses the claim requirements of “wherein the managed device is coupled to a proxy, wherein the proxy is a computational device , and wherein the receiving, the traversing, the modifying and the generating are performed by the proxy.”

Col. 5, lines 50-60 of the cited Wang is as follows:

“The network is implemented using cabling or other physical hardware for connecting communications software running on various computing devices coupled to the network. The management server node 12 is coupled by means of a network 10 to a large number of appliance server nodes 14 only one of which is depicted in FIG. 4. In an E-commerce application, the number of server appliance nodes 14 can be many thousand, with multiple numbers of these server appliances installed in a server rack, all tightly spaced within the confines of a single room. Each server appliance node provides data storage and computing power for use by the E-commerce business utilizing those computers.”

Applicants respectfully submit that nowhere does col. 5, lines 50-60 of the cited Wang teach or disclose the claim requirements that the receiving, the traversing, the modifying and the generating are performed by the proxy.”

For the above reasons, claims 34, 45, 56 are patentable over the cited art.

Conclusion

For all the above reasons, Applicant submits that the pending claims are patentable over the art of record. Should any additional fees beyond those indicated be required, please charge Deposit Account No. 09-0466.

The attorney/agent invites the Examiner to contact him at (310) 557-2292 if the Examiner believes such contact would advance the prosecution of the case.

Date: December 23, 2008

By: _____/Rabindranath Dutta/_____

Rabindranath Dutta
Registration No. 51,010

Please direct all correspondences to:

Rabindranath Dutta
Konrad Raynes & Victor, LLP
315 South Beverly Drive, Ste. 210
Beverly Hills, CA 90212
Tel: (310) 557-2292
Fax: 310-556-7984